

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:  
MARK J. GATSCHET  
JENKENS & GILCHRIST  
1401 MCKINNEY  
SUITE 2600  
HOUSTON, TX 77010

## PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

**22 NOV 2005**

Applicant's or agent's file reference <b>50657-01404</b>		Date of mailing (day/month/year) <b>22 NOV 2005</b>	
<b>FOR FURTHER ACTION</b> See paragraph 2 below			
International application No. <b>PCT/US04/26508</b>	International filing date (day/month/year) <b>13 August 2004 (13.08.2004)</b>	Priority date (day/month/year) <b>13 August 2003 (13.08.2003)</b>	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC <b>IPC(7): A61K 38/17, 31/728; C07K 14/435 and US Cl.: 514/12, 54; 530/324; 930/20, DIG500</b>			
Applicant <b>WYETH</b>			

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I      Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II      Priority
- ☒ Box No. III      Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☒ Box No. IV      Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V      Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI      Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII      Certain defects in the international application
- ☒ Box No. VIII      Certain observations on the international application

### 2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/ US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (571) 273-3201	Date of completion of this opinion <b>17 October 2005 (17.10.2005)</b>	Authorized officer <b>Rosanne Kosson</b> Telephone No. <b>571-272-1600</b>
--	---	--

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/US04/26508

**Box No. I Basis of this opinion**

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

- ☒ the international application in the language in which it was filed  
☐ a translation of the international application into \_\_\_\_\_, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

- ☒ a sequence listing  
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

- ☒ on paper  
☒ in electronic form

c. time of filing/furnishing

- ☒ contained in the international application as filed.  
☒ filed together with the international application in electronic form.  
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US04/26508

**Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability**

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non-obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

☐ the entire international application

☒ claims Nos. 20 and 21

because:

☐ the said international application, or the said claim Nos. \_\_\_\_\_ relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international search (*specify*):

☐ the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. \_\_\_\_\_ are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

☒ the claims, or said claims Nos. 20 and 21 are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

See Box No. VIII (Certain observations on the international application).

☒ no international search report has been established for said claims Nos. 20-21

☐ a meaningful opinion could not be formed without the sequence listing; the applicant did not, within the prescribed time limit:

☐ furnish a sequence listing on paper complying with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions, and such listing was not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.

☐ furnish a sequence listing in electronic form complying with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions, and such listing was not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.

☐ pay the required late furnishing fee for the furnishing of a sequence listing in response to an invitation under Rules 13ter.1(a) or (b).

☐ a meaningful opinion could not be formed without the tables related to the sequence listings; the applicant did not, within the prescribed time limit, furnish such tables in electronic form complying with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions, and such tables were not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.

☐ the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in electronic form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.

☐ See Supplemental Box for further details.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US04/26508

Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention

1. ☒ In response to the invitation (Form PCT/ISA/206) to pay additional fees the applicant has, within the applicable time limit:
- ☐ paid additional fees
  - ☐ paid additional fees under protest and, where applicable, the protest fee
  - ☐ paid additional fees under protest but the applicable protest fee was not paid
  - ☒ not paid additional fees
2. ☐ This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite the applicant to pay additional fees.
3. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rule 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is
- ☐ complied with
  - ☒ not complied with for the following reasons:  
See the lack of unity section of the International Search Report (Form PCT/ISA/210).

4. Consequently, this opinion has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application:
- ☐ all parts.
  - ☒ the parts relating to claims Nos. 1 and 19

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.  
PCT/US04/26508

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>1 and 19</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims <u>1 and 19</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1 and 19</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Claims 1 and 19 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a protein comprising the sequence of SEQ ID NO: 9.

Claims 1 and 19 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/US04/26508

**Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application**

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the questions whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

Claims 20 - 21 are objected to as lacking clarity under PCT Rule 66.2(a)(v) because the claims are not fully supported by the description. The description does not disclose the claimed invention in a manner sufficiently clear and complete for the claimed invention to be carried out by a person skilled in the art because it provides no indication as to how much of the protein of claim 19 is a therapeutically effective amount in any subject.